

August 4, 1965

Approved For Release 2004/10/27 : CIA-RDP67-00446R000300060015-7

18720

Convinced that this was a true cause, I began discussing the case with my family and friends. Few were sympathetic or understood the facts in the Otepka case. It is up to the U.S. Congress to ratify a declaration of war, yet the State Department is trying to stop its officials from testifying honestly before this same Congress. They persecute us for telling the truth and for trying to defend himself and protect and promote William Wieland and John Reilly, who gave evasive and false testimony. People told me I would get in trouble defending a "right-winger," like Otepka, or "I was saying this because I was a Republican," or even "I was saying that because Edith was a personal friend of mine." The pro-Rusk, pro-State Department press had done a great job. No one realized the case affected the security of the whole country.

Now our young men are being called to fight in Vietnam, and it touches all of us. And now the State Department has cleared William Wieland and sent him to a sensitive post as Consul General to Canberra, Australia. Soon we'll be getting reports about Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Robin Hood, and the savior of Vietnam. Don't be surprised if the postmark on the reports are Canberra, Australia. Winston Churchill once stated, "Peace will not be preserved by pious sentiments expressed in terms of platitudes, or by official grimaces and diplomatic correctitude."

The boys who give their lives in Vietnam, or died in Korea cannot picket the State Department. What a pity. Because of the well-known "wedge" at Peggy Bottoms, President Johnson is now sending "the Sower of American youth," to fight and perhaps die in Vietnam. Let us, the American public, demand that the mess in the State Department be cleaned up, and that they get rid of security risks instead of firing loyal security officers.

[From the Washington Star]
OTEPKA CASE

The showdown which is shaping up between the State Department and the Senate Judiciary Committee, or rather its Subcommittee on Internal Security, is both necessary and desirable. For the issues are of highest importance.

What is involved here is a seeming collision between the undoubted rights of the State Department to maintain proper security procedures within the Department and the equally undeniable right of the Senate (and the public) to know whether sloppy State Department procedures have been endangering national security.

The Department has preferred charges which could lead to the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, chief of State's security evaluations division. These charges were developed after such spy-thriller techniques as searching Mr. Otepka's "burn basket," reading the imprint on his carbon paper, deciphering used typewriter ribbons, patching together torn up notes, etc. Furthermore, a Department official has issued an order forbidding employees to appear before the Senate subcommittee without obtaining advance clearance from State. It is also specified in the order that "this includes contact or interviews with any members of the staff of the subcommittee." This covers a lot of territory.

Naturally, the Senators, or at least those immediately involved, are up in arms. And they should be. For the order to the employees and the action against Mr. Otepka could serve to clamp down the lid on information from the State Department to which the Senate, if not the public, should have access. If this is what is being done, every possible pressure should be brought to bear to stop it.

We find it hard to believe, however, that Secretary Rusk would condone any such activity. It runs counter to his nature and

he is too sensible. Nevertheless, it is good that the Senate has called upon him to testify and that he has agreed to do so. The issue comes down to a question of just what Mr. Otepka was doing. The typewriter ribbons, the used carbon paper, and the rest should tell the story.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 18, 1963]
THE OTEPKA CASE

Your editorial on "The Otepka Case" leads me to believe that you, like most of the uninformed American public, just don't have all the facts. Please don't think I am saying this to criticize your very fine newspaper; my criticism is with the present White House policy of withholding news, slanting news, and, in general, trying to control what used to be the free press.

Has anyone really reported what happened at the time of the Castro takeover in Cuba or why the Bay of Pigs invasion was such a dismal failure or where the American forces were while the Communists built the Berlin Wall? Or doesn't the American public have a need to know?

Fortunately, in "The Otepka Case" there is a U.S. Government Printing Office report on the subcommittee hearing. It is titled, "Committee Print, State Department Security, Case of William Wieland, New Passport Regulations, the Office of Security, No. 87246, 87th Congress." Having read this report, I would advise you to get a copy if they are still available. Then perhaps you will see that the issue is not just what Mr. Otepka was doing, but what a fine job he and others like him have been doing for many years and what the State Department is now trying to do to him, the U.S. Senate, and the American public.

MYRA FINKEL.

PROPOSED PURCHASE OF NAVAL VESSELS ABROAD

(Mr. DOWNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I was shocked to learn that the Defense Department was considering the purchase of some \$80 million worth of Navy vessels from Great Britain.

Our House Armed Services Committee is now holding hearings on a number of bills proposed to prohibit Navy vessel purchases in Great Britain.

During one of these hearings, Mr. Speaker, I learned that the Interior Department is now considering the purchase of two stern-ramp fishing trawlers from Communist Poland.

I am unable to understand proposals of this kind, Mr. Speaker. The shipbuilding industry in the United States is a depressed industry. I understand that 18 private yards have closed down during the past 10 years. We also are scheduled to close two Government yards in Brooklyn and New Hampshire.

We in the Government should be considering proposals to protect and promote our domestic shipbuilding industry—not proposals that will further depress it. But what is the situation today?

First, the DOD is talking about building navy vessels in Great Britain.

Second, the Maritime Administration is talking about building subsidized lines in foreign yards, and now, third, we learn of a proposal to build fishing vessels in Poland.

We are conducting hearings on No. 1; No. 2 is prohibited by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, the third item can be accomplished now without further consideration by the Congress. Therefore, I would like to suggest that the appropriate committees of the Congress schedule hearings on the acquisition of fishing trawlers from Communist Poland by the Interior Department as soon as practicable. I believe the Members of this body would want to know more about the proposal. We should know more about it, Mr. Speaker, in view of the economic situation within our domestic ship construction industry, so I am deeply hopeful hearings can soon be scheduled. To this end, I am now considering the preparation of legislation to prohibit the construction of fishing trawlers in Poland by the Interior Department.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I know that there is always something meritorious about every proposal, and I know the Interior Department would not make a suggestion without justification. I have worked closely with the Department on many occasions; I know the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is dedicated to our domestic fisheries. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should be given a full opportunity to know all the facts on any proposal that may be harmful to one of our industries while it helps an industry in a Communist nation.

ABOLITION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I, with 28 of my colleagues, voted against appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee. I voted the way I did with the conviction I was speaking for many, many Americans.

I am very pleased, therefore, to read the following resolution passed at the New York annual conference of the Methodist Church, as follows:

The New York annual conference of the Methodist Church, meeting in its 108th session at the University of Bridgeport, Conn., June 16-20, 1965, expresses its belief that we must maintain our civil liberties in order to work for civil rights and for peace. We, therefore, call for (a) the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee; (b) the repeal of the McCarran Act.

A FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH STUDY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MASS TRANSIT

(Mr. STALBAUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which is identical to H.R. 8200, introduced June 17 by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Starnes. Congress

Approved For Release 2004/10/27 : CIA-RDP67-00446R000300060015-7